

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,748,974 to Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,775 to Eberman et al, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,265,014 to Haddock. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

The burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness is only satisfied by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074 (Fed. Cir. 1988). A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Bell, 991 F.2d 781, 782 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. The suggestion to combine the references should come from the prior art, and the Examiner cannot use hindsight gleaned from the invention itself to pick and choose among related disclosures in the prior art in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. In re Fine, 837 F.2d at 1075.

Here, it is respectfully submitted that at the very minimum, the combination of Johnson, Eberman and Haddock is legally deficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 to support the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections are based on impermissible hindsight reasoning through selective

teachings of Johnson, Eberman and Haddock , and that no motivation has been shown for justifying the combination of such teachings as against claims 1, 10 and 19. Indeed, at the very minimum, Applicants respectfully submit that such combination does not teach or suggest *a dialog manager using a multi-modal history for determining the current context of a command received, wherein the command is associated with one of a plurality of active applications*, as essentially claimed in claims 1, 10 and 19, much less *wherein the events in the multi-modal history include change of dialog focus events*, as essentially claimed in claim 19.

In the Office Action, Examiner acknowledges that Johnson does not disclose *the application associated with the command being one of a plurality of active applications*. In an attempt to cure the deficiencies of Johnson, Examiner cites Eberman as disclosing *an application user interface which allows the user to control the activities of multiple applications ...* “. Examiner then presumably acknowledges that neither Johnson nor Eberman discloses *the dialog manager determining current context of the command by reviewing a multi-modal history of events*, but relies on Haddock as disclosing *a multi-modal user interface for removing referential ambiguity from a natural language input*.

Although Eberman arguably discloses multiple applications, Eberman does not disclose or suggest *a dialog manager using a multi-modal history for determining the current context of a command received, wherein the command is associated with one of a plurality of active applications*, In fact, Eberman discloses a mechanism wherein each application registers a set of rules, wherein portions of input texts that are recognized as corresponding to text of the rules are

used to determine which commands for a given application to execute (Col. 5, lines 60-65).

Thus, the Eberman system is limited in that the *current context of a command received* is determined by matching input text of a user to text of the registered. Eberman does not disclose a mechanism for resolving ambiguities, and input commands must match the texts of the rules.

Furthermore, the teachings of Haddock do not cure the deficiencies of Johnson and Eberman. In fact, the Examiner has not provided sufficient motivation for combining the teachings of Haddock with the teaching of Johnson and Eberman to support the contention that such combination teaches *using a multi-modal history to determining the current context of a command received, wherein the command is associated with one of a plurality of active applications*, as essentially claimed in claims 1, 10 and 19.

On page 4 of the Office Action, it is contended that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify Johnson to implement determining current context of user input response by reviewing a history of events as suggested by Haddock, for the purpose of providing a user friendly way to resolve ambiguity in a natural language system.” It is respectfully submitted that such basis for obviousness is legally deficient and misses the point.

In particular, by way of example, even assuming arguendo, that the query cards disclosed by Haddock comprises a “history of events” as contended by Examiner, the Haddock system relies on manual user interaction with such “history” and actual human intelligence processing on part of the user to resolve an ambiguity of a command. This has no relation to the claimed process of determining by a dialog manager the current context of a command by reviewing a

history of events, wherein the current command is associated with one of a plurality of active application, as essentially claimed in claims 1, 10 and 19

Furthermore, Haddock is limited to a single active application (a database application). As such, Haddock does not disclose or remotely suggest method for determining current context of commands between multiple active applications. In fact, Haddock provides no teaching for any mechanism for using *a multi-modal history to determining the current context of a command received, wherein the command is associated with one of a plurality of active applications*, as essentially claimed in claims 1, 10 and 19.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 19, given that Haddock discloses user interaction with a single database application, Examiner cannot reasonably contend that Haddock teaches or even remotely suggests *wherein the events in the multi-modal history include change of dialog focus events*, as essentially claimed in claim 19. Indeed, although Haddock arguably discloses maintaining a history of successive queries or “events linked by time”, there is nothing in Haddock that remotely suggests a history of events including change of dialog focus events - indeed, with one active application, there is never a change in dialog focus to a different application.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, claims 1, 10 and 19 are believed to be patentable and non-obvious over the combination of Johnson, Eberman and Haddock. Further, all dependent claims are believed to be nonobvious and patentable over such combination at least for the reasons given above for respective base claims 1, 10 and 19.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLP
1900 Hempstead Tnpk.
East Meadow, NY 11553
TEL.: (516) 357-0091
FAX: (516) 357-0092